



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,148	11/21/2001	Mikael Lagerman	4740-018	2131

24112 7590 06/06/2005

COATS & BENNETT, PLLC
P O BOX 5
RALEIGH, NC 27602

EXAMINER

PARTON, KEVIN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,148

Applicant(s)

LAGERMAN, MIKAEL

Examiner

Kevin Parton

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 8, 10 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/25.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

20

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Claims 5, 6, 8, 10, and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities: they are dependent upon themselves. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 6, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claims 6, 8, 10 recites the limitation "said historical configuration data to be substituted" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208).

7. Regarding claims 1 and 11, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach a system for maintaining configuration data in a database with means for:

- a. Storing current configuration data representing a current configuration of said network in a database as a collection of managed objects, wherein each managed object has attributes corresponding to variables that can be configured to manage and control operation of the network (column 4, lines 45-49, 56-62).
- b. Storing historical configuration data representing past configurations of said network in said database as a collection of changed objects, wherein each changed object represents a past configuration of one of said managed objects that has been changed (column 5, lines 18-25).

8. Regarding claims 4, 12, and 24, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach all the limitations as applied to claims 1, 11, and 23, respectively. They further teach means for storing, contemporaneously with storing said historical configuration data, change parameters associated with the change (column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46).

9. Regarding claim 5, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 4. They further teach means wherein the change parameters include a timestamp (column 8, lines 41-42).

10. Regarding claim 7, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 5. They further teach means wherein the change parameters include an operator identification (column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46). Note that the operator or user logged in to the system would be stored.

11. Regarding claim 19, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach a system for maintaining configuration data associated with one or more managed objects in a communication network, the system comprising:

- a. One or more changed objects storing historical configuration data (column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46).
- b. Wherein each changed object represents a past configuration of a managed objects that has been changed (column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46).
- c. Wherein each changed object includes at least one change parameter relating to a change in the corresponding managed object (column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 41-46).

12. Regarding claim 20, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 19. They further teach means wherein said change parameter is a timestamp representing the time of a corresponding change to the managed object (column 8, lines 41-43).

13. Regarding claim 21, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 20. They further teach means wherein the change parameter is a user identification of a user that made a corresponding change to the managed object (column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46). Note that the operator or user logged in to the system would be stored.

14. Regarding claim 23, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach a system comprising:

- a. A network entity comprising one or more managed objects, each managed object having one or more configurable attributes that can be configured by a user (column 4, lines 45-49, 56-62; column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46)
- b. A database for storing the current configuration of the managed objects (column 4, lines 45-49, 56-62; column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46).
- c. One or more changed objects stored in said database, wherein each changed objects represents a past configuration of one of said managed objects that has been changed (column 5, lines 18-25; column 8, lines 43-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 22, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) in view of Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070).

17. Regarding claims 2 and 25, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claims 1 and 23, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for restoring said database

to a prior version by restoring historical configuration data from at least one changed object.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) as evidenced by Nusch et a. (USPN 6,338,070).

In an analogous art, Nusch et a. (USPN 6,338,070) discloses a system for storing operating data of network elements in a database with means for restoring said database to a prior version by restoring historical configuration data from at least one changed object (column 1, lines 58-64; column 2, lines 55-65).

Given the teaching of Nusch et a. (USPN 6,338,070), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by allowing the database to be restored to a previous operating condition. This benefits the system by allowing it to be returned to an earlier, operational state, when configuration changes have caused failures.

18. Regarding claims 3, 14, and 26, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claims 1, 11, and 23, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for altering said database by selectively restoring historical configuration data from one or more changed objects.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) as evidenced by Nusch et a. (USPN 6,338,070).

In an analogous art, Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070) discloses a system for storing operating data of network elements in a database with means for altering said database by selectively restoring historical configuration data from one or more changed objects (column 1, lines 58-64; column 2, lines 55-65).

Given the teaching of Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by allowing any object in the database to be restored to a previous operating condition. This benefits the system by allowing it to be returned to an earlier, operational state, when configuration changes have caused failures.

19. Regarding claim 6, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claim 5) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein said historical configuration data to be substituted into said database is selected based on said timestamp.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by utilizing a timestamp to substitute historical configuration data. This benefits the system by allowing an administrator to locate the correct configuration based on a point in time when the system was configured in the desired manner.

20. Regarding claim 8, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claim 7) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein said historical configuration data to be substituted into said database is selected based on said operator identification.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by utilizing an operator identification to substitute historical configuration data. This benefits the system by allowing an administrator to locate the correct user's machine in order to replace the current configuration with a historical one.

21. Regarding claims 9 and 22, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claims 5 and 20, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the change parameters include a group code.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by including a group code as a change parameter. This benefits the system by allowing an administrator to identify a group within the network for storage of historical information.

22. Regarding claim 10, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claim 9) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the historical configuration data to be substituted into said database is selected based on said group code.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by utilizing a group code to substitute historical configuration data. This benefits the system by allowing an administrator to easily reconfigure the devices for a single group that needs historical configuration restored.

23. Regarding claims 15 and 27, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claims 12 and 23, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for storing prospective configuration data stored as one or more changed objects representing proposed changes to one or more managed objects.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) as evidenced by Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070).

In an analogous art, Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070) discloses a system for storing operating data of network elements in a database with means for storing prospective configuration data stored as one or more changed objects representing

Art Unit: 2153

proposed changes to one or more managed objects (column 1, lines 58-64; column 2, lines 55-65). Please note that since historical data can be restored, this can also be considered prospective data.

Given the teaching of Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by allowing the database to store prospective configuration information. This benefits the system by allowing the administrator to store data that can quickly be accessed and use in case of a system failure.

24. Regarding claims 16 and 28, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claims 15 and 26, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for altering said database by selectively restoring prospective configuration data from one or more changed objects.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) as evidenced by Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070).

In an analogous art, Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070) discloses a system for storing operating data of network elements in a database with means for altering said database by selectively restoring prospective configuration data from one or more changed objects (column 1, lines 58-64; column 2, lines 55-65).

Given the teaching of Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by allowing any object in the database to be reconfigured to a prospective operating condition. This benefits the system by allowing it to be returned to an known, operational state, when configuration changes have caused failures.

25. Regarding claims 17 and 29, Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) teach all the limitations as applied to claims 15 and 27, respectively. He further teaches means wherein the database includes both historical configuration data and prospective configuration data (column 5, lines 18-25).

26. Regarding claims 18 and 30, although the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) (as applied to claims 17 and 29, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein said database is altered by selectively substituting prospective configuration data associated with one or more said changed objects for the associated current configuration data, and selectively substituting historical configuration data associated with one or more other of said changed objects for the associated current configuration data.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) as evidenced by Nusch et a. (USPN 6,338,070).

In an analogous art, Nusch et a. (USPN 6,338,070) discloses a system for storing operating data of network elements in a database with means wherein said database is altered by selectively substituting prospective configuration data associated with one or more said changed objects for the associated current configuration data,

and selectively substituting historical configuration data associated with one or more other of said changed objects for the associated current configuration data (column 1, lines 58-64; column 2, lines 55-65).

Given the teaching of Nusch et al. (USPN 6,338,070), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Moeller et al. (USPN 6,662,208) by allowing any object in the database to be restored to a previous operating condition. This benefits the system by allowing it to be returned to an earlier, operational state, when configuration changes have caused failures. Further, it benefits the system to allow for the reconfiguration of devices using prospective data because this allows the administrator to easily implement proposed configuration changes.

Conclusion

27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see the following:

- a. Pike (USPN 6,721,880)
- b. Nederveen et al. (USPN 6,853,623)


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (571)272-3958. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin Parton
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

ksp


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100